DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 221 JC 690 261

By-Jensen, Mary E.

The Preparation of Faculty for the Implementation of Innovations in Curriculum and Instruction: Guidelines for Orientation and In-Service Education Programs.

Pub Date Mar 69
Note-37p.; Seminar paper
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.95
Descriptors-*Innovation, *Inservice Teacher Education, *Instructional Innovation, *Junior Colleges, *Teacher Orientation

Growth of colleges, varying faculty experience, and program and student body diversity have accentuated the need for sound faculty orientation and in-service programs, especially where innovation, development, and use of new instructional media are stressed. After interviewing 11 faculty members at three colleges, the author has prepared 23 guidelines, for single or combined use. They are: find out the college's views on in-service training and innovation; determine the needs and experience of the faculty; set up clear communication channels; budget for in-service training, orientation, innovation; select responsible administrative officers; develop goals and objectives for all programs; prepare to evaluate them; design data-gathering tools; note the process of change in committee and faculty sessions; plan orientation and in-service programs far ahead of fall term; be sure they are comprehensive; use any new media (hard- and software) in demonstrations to the faculty; provide reference materials; allow for informal discussion breaks and for individual and group sessions in the schedule; spread the gospel of change and innovation; include outside authorities and consultants in the sessions; allow for release of "gripes" in intensive sessions; seek out the innovators in present staff and when hiring new members; give incentives to innovators (released time, professional meeting time, praise); provide technical, clerical, and research support; establish reciprocity of commitment. (HH)

ED031221

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE PREPARATION OF FACULTY FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INNOVATIONS IN CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION: GUIDELINES FOR ORIENTATION AND IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Seminar Paper

Presented to
Dr. B. Lamar Johnson
School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for 261D
Seminar: The Junior College Curriculum

by
Mary E. Jensen
March, 1969

JC 690 261

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	Introduction and Recognition of the Problem	1
	Purposes of the Study	4
	Significance of the Study	4
	Limitations of the Study	5
	Definition of Terms	5
II	Review of the Literature	7
III	Rationale for Orientation and In-Service Education Programs in Innovative Community Colleges	15
IV	The Nature and Extent of Orientation and In-Service Education Programs in Innovative Community Colleges	19
	Interviews	20
	Faculty Orientation at Oakland Community College	22
V	Recommended Guidelines for Orientation and In-Service Education Programs in Innovative Community Colleges - Or - How To Do It	25
VI	Summary and Conclusions	30

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND RECOGNITION OF THE PROBLEM

Orientation and in-service education are two major concerns of community college faculty. Garrison, after interviewing faculty throughout the country, indicates that administrators will find it necessary to devote additional attention and resources to the content of both these concerns. Proliferation of colleges, the diverse preparation and experience of faculty, together with the emphasis on instruction of a heterogeneous student body in a wide variety of courses and programs, contribute to the need for orientation and in-service education programs. New expectations, new knowledge, and new hardware provide sources for innovation and a resulting need for "know how" in their use (24).

What is wrong with existing programs? The candid comments of a new instructor vividly express the urgent need for orientation and in-service education programs in community colleges.

> 'I really flapped around here my first semester,' said one new instructor. 'My first day, we had what they called a "new faculty workshop". But all it really amounted to was making sure we knew how to handle all the forms and paperwork, and how to keep roll books, and all that. And my department head tried his best to help me get started. We discussed texts and department exams and the kinds of things I was expected to teach in my classes. But when I met my first class a couple of days later, I certainly realized how little I knew that I should have known. The students were, in many ways, very different from anything I had expected. They asked me a lot of questions about the college that I couldn't begin to answer. I knew I'd have my own questions for the veterans in my

> department. But our schedules were all so different, I didn't see them very often. And at department meetings, we had too much else in the way of business for me to take up everybody's time with my ignorance. As I said, it took me about a semester to get my bearings and to have some kind of a realistic notion about what this college is trying to do, and my part in it.' (16:47-48)

These remarks clearly imply that a welcome, introduction, reference to broad goals and expectations of the college, and attention to the housekeeping details of initiating and continuing the school year do not constitute effective orientation to the college. As the new and returning instructor leaves such a session the realization that the next day, or shortly thereafter, he must be prepared to meet students begins to have an impact on him and he wonders 'can he do it?'.

Orientation programs in new community colleges may be somewhat longer and more inclusive, but by and large they follow the same format and expect the same results--instructors are expected to produce shortly after arriving on the campus. Faculty members are brought together throughout the year for announcements, reports on the status of the college, the budget, policy changes, and to hear consultants and visiting professors. These informative sessions are necessary, but are not expressly to increase or improve the instructor's teaching ability or his concept of the community college, the breadth of its purpose, and the people it serves.

This description is not an exaggeration of conditions but a characteristic picture of the present state of orientation and in-service education programs in many community colleges. A realistic examination of the instructional process reveals that an instructor

cannot begin to do justice to a teaching assignment without adequate initial orientation and continuing in-service education. The problem is one of greater magnitude where innovation is stressed. Faculty and administrators must be oriented and plans made for continuing assistance in the development and use of new instructional media. Consideration must be given also to the orientation of students in the use of the new software and hardware.

My experience in two multi-district new community colleges, one of them highly experimental in nature, has sharpened my awareness of the need for orientation and in-service education in the community college. My concerns mount as I observe the rush to innovate without adequate attention to the preparation of faculty and administrators relative to the process of change, the development and implementation of innovative materials and practices.

Community college teaching requires the ability to adjust courses to a wide variety of students. Preparation of the teacher should include emphasis on the application of learning principles and theories. The greatest responsibility for faculty preparation rests with the senior institutions, but it can be augmented by internships, practice teaching, orientation and in-service education programs. What should be the nature of such orientation and in-service education programs? How should they be modified in the presence of innovations in curriculum and instruction?

Purposes of the Study

It was the purpose of this study to: (1) state the rationale for faculty orientation and in-service education programs in innovative community colleges, (2) determine the nature and extent of orientation and in-service education programs in innovative community colleges, and (3) recommend guidelines for orientation and in-service education programs in innovative community colleges.

Significance of the Study

What are current practices in faculty orientation and in-service education programs in innovative institutions? One of the contributions of this study could be to identify current practices or the lack of them in the colleges. It could suggest strengths and weaknesses, and make recommendations for developing or changing the programs.

The findings of this study could be of value to administrators who normally have the responsibility for developing orientation and in-service education programs. Faculty members might find the study helpful to them as they seek ways to initiate innovations or to suggest ways in which they might participate in such programs.

A long-range value of the study, provided that it can facilitate the orientation, in-service education, and utilization of faculty and staff, would be to alter or create change in the learning environment and thus contribute to more effective and efficient student learning.

Limitations of the Study

The study contains no built-in evaluative research. A limited number of colleges (3) were visited and a very limited number of faculty, administrators, and supporting staff were involved in interviews. The visits to the colleges were pre-arranged, but interviews with individuals, with the exception of the dean of instruction, were not pre-arranged. Therefore, it was necessary to interview persons whose schedules allowed time to discuss the programs, their value, and the individual's role in relation to them. Though every attempt was made to ask the same general questions of those interviewed, no formal instrument was utilized. The nature of the interviews varied and since the number in each area was so limited, generalizations must be interpreted in light of this limitation.

Definition of Terms

Change is marked by degrees and may be interpreted to mean the process of making different. Change, meaning alteration or modification, implies a process which is short of completely converting to something else. Radical or drastic change suggests transformation or conversion to a totally different form or position. These forms of change, to be effective, occur through dialogue and cooperation (29).

Faculty means members of the instructional staff who hold academic rank (if used in the college) or contractual appointment. It includes the individuals whose responsibilities relate to the

instructing and counseling functions and learning resources or library services of the college.

Innovation is a process closely related to change. It is used in this study to indicate planned, deliberate deviation from established doctrine or practice or a new program, practice or approach to curriculum, instruction, orientation or in-service education.

In-service Education is deliberately designed education occurring while faculty and administrators are employed in the service of the college. It is synonymous with staff development and continuing education. Aspects of in-service education are orientation and skill training. Borrowed from the world of work, skill training can be interpreted to mean education that will keep a faculty member or administrator up-to-date in the knowledge and skill required in his position (34).

Orientation, as has been suggested, is one aspect of in-service education. It is a planned program to introduce a new faculty member to the college and his responsibilities. It may also be interpreted to mean an introduction to, or guidance in, experience or activity of a new kind--innovation. It need not be limited to new employees (34).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Literature on the processes of change and innovation is growing. Literature pertaining to in-service education and orientation is not as abundant. Literature specific to the preparation of faculty for the implementation of innovations in curriculum and instruction is almost non-existent. A review of the Junior College Journals from 1963 produced fewer than ten articles related to the subject. Therefore, this review will attempt to identify literature which has implications for the processes of change and innovation, for orientation and in-service education programs. No attempt will be made to survey literature which describes specific innovations or which the writer reviewed in a previous paper (21).

Eric Hoffer wrote:

> It is my impression that no one really likes the new. We are afraid of it. It is not only as Dostoyevsky put it that 'taking a new step, uttering a new word is what people fear most'. Even in slight things the experience of the new is rarely without some stirring of foreboding (25:1).

After relating his own feelings involving changing jobs from picking peas to picking stringbeans, Hoffer states that even this change proved feelings of fear. He continues:

> In the case of drastic change the uneasiness is of course deeper and more lasting. We can never be really prepared for that which is wholly new. We have to adjust ourselves, and every radical adjustment is a crisis in self-esteem: we undergo a test, we have to prove ourselves. It needs inordinate self-confidence to face drastic change without inner trembling (25:1-2).

Gardner associates change and innovation with crises and problems, indicating that effective innovations may well

increase the chances of survival of a threatened system. He notes that crises put people in the mood to accept innovation and that innovators must be alert to take advantage of such situations. He finds a close relationship between creativity, innovation, and self-renewal, and suggests that certain traits are shared by individuals possessing these characteristics. These include: openness, independence, flexibility, and capacity to find order in experience (15).

Similarly, Keuscher relates openness with tendencies to innovate and closedness with rigidity and inflexibility. He finds that innovative colleges exhibit close contact with their environment, express clearly defined goals, evidence adequate planning and preparation for change, express clearly defined decision-making procedures, and maintain open and functioning channels of communication (23).

Dale states that change is not sought by individuals or by universities. Change and innovation disturb the status quo, make waves, and may be troublesome and uncomfortable. Change involves taking risks and the possibility of failure. Dale cites outmoded machinery of curriculum development, lack of reward for curriculum innovation, failure to define specific course objectives, ineffective methods of evaluation, and failure in the application of ideas as reasons for the lack of change in colleges and universities (13).

Upton cites the necessity for strong presidential commitment to change. Accompanying that must be a faculty interest in change, which may develop out of dissatisfaction with accomplishments in higher education or in the college. Together with interest there must be commitment and involvement in the inquiry. He argues for the

necessity to fully grapple with the issues, indicating that a hesitant or half-hearted approach will not create an adequate climate for change. He notes that restlessness, impatience, rancor, friction, and dissension accompany change, but that time and patience will prevent the development of permanent schism within the faculty. Full involvement of faculty through the use of faculty committees and the use of outside consultants are seen as essential to promote involvement, avoid ingrown characteristics, provide a stimulus to initiative and enthusiasm, check hypotheses with experts, and have an objective means to evaluate overall efforts (37).

Miles, in discussing educational innovation, proposes that emphasis ought to be directed at consideration of the process of change, why innovations spread or fail to spread, and the causes of resistance. He suggests that special characteristics of educational systems and proposed innovations, conditions within a system which may facilitate or hinder change, processes during change, characteristics of innovative persons or groups, the fate of innovations, and reasons for change in innovation rates are kinds of questions which anyone interested in the study of educational innovation must understand (27).

Johnson, in his forthcoming book, reports that colleges and universities resist change rather than subject themselves to the upheavals of innovation. He does, hopefully, note that planned changes are being made and that the junior college gives promise of being a leader in innovative developments. He identifies the rapid growth of junior colleges and the relative lack of long-established tradition as encouraging change. Pressures to keep up with increasing

demands of expansion, together with the demands of senior college and university requirements, lack of administrative support, and poor communication can retard innovation and experimentation. The author emphasizes that innovation is facilitated by providing financial assistance, involving those affected by change in its planning, encouraging creativity by faculty in devising new approaches to teaching, and allowing faculty the right to fail (22).

Wessell attributes most innovation to outside sources; however, he also states: "I believe that innovation that is generated within the institution by faculty members themselves, is likely to be more significant in its effects, better tested, and longer-lasting than change that is imposed from without" (44:205). He cites a committee on innovation and experimentation, involvement of students, adequate financial resources, and improved assessment techniques as of value to innovation efforts (39).

Adelson proposes that maintaining a high rate of production of good new ideas, examining and evaluating proposed innovations prior to adoption or rejection, wise allocation of available resources, and institutionalizing the process of change raise the likelihood of adoption of innovations (1).

Michael identifies lack of consensus on the purposes of education, negative faculty attitudes toward students and innovations, rigid institutional rules and regulations, and political factors as hindering innovation. He notes that social disaster, the use of techniques of social research, and federal support facilitate innovation (26).

Nasatir believes that the basic structure of American education

is resistant to change and that proponents of innovation must take this into account when proposing change. He contends that traditional morality associated with education, the teaching profession which guards this morality, the social structure of the schools, and implicit and obscure educational goals contribute to this resistance (28).

Brawer, in discussing innovation and the individual, identifies the necessity to know who will accept or regret change, the conditions which existed before changes were implemented, and how the results of change may be evaluated. She suggests that teachers should be trained to recognize and develop creativity, be innovative in themselves, and be given freedom to experiment and express their creativity. She notes that conditions which promote creative behavior and development of innovative ideas are not well formulated. However, it is known that generalizations, compulsive behavior, criticalness, emotional inhibition, and other characteristics which relate to authoritarianism do discourage creativity and innovation (5). She concludes:

> Change can come about by trial and error, by defining outcomes, and by trying different ways to see if these outcomes may be achieved. To be a truly successful innovator, one must be able to check results, to know how to change people's behavior, and to get them thinking and acting in new ways. This requires that the flexible individual, who is aware of other people's needs, be put into positions where he can make decisions regarding whether or not changes in a given situation appear desirable, what type of changes are most needed, and how these changes may be brought about. (5:45)

Brickell, in discussing the introduction of change in schools, states that the process may arouse feelings of insecurity and inadequacy which should be distinguished from outright resistance to change. He proposes that: "The most successful innovations are those which are

accompanied by the most elaborate help to teachers as they begin to provide the new instruction". The implication of this fact is that "Instructional innovation should be accompanied by substantial continuing assistance to teachers" (8:31).

Underlining the importance of preparation is Brickell's contention that the real source of rigidity is the ill-prepared, ill-informed, and ill-equipped teacher (7).

Carpenter and Greenhill suggest that new media should stimulate students, represent reality, enable teachers to vary their patterns of instruction, and span time, space, and culture. New media may require teachers to modify the traditional teaching relationship where the principal interaction is between the student and teacher. This may be in error and the principal interaction or transaction should be between the learner and the materials to be learned.

The writers place considerable emphasis on well-prepared faculty with continuous training. They suggest conditions which favor successful introduction of newer media, cautions for its use, and urge research (9).

Cooper cites complacency on the part of faculty, inadequate financial incentives, and the fatigue of young faculty as the factors which delay advances toward more effective instruction in higher education. He relates faculty involvement, improved methods of appraisal, administrative support, and inter-institutional cooperation as contributing to faculty improvement (11).

Gusfield discusses factors having implications for change and innovation in higher education and contends that students will become

effective change agents. He proposes that the ideology of change in higher education will come more from students than from administrators, and more from administrators than faculty (13).

Cogen declares that if teachers are to be effective as agents of change they must be encouraged to experiment with methods and materials, participate in curriculum planning, attend educational conferences, and be given time to plan creative activities. Teachers should be elevated to positions of shared authority and be given better in-service training.

He cites the importance of having universities stress innovation, evaluation, and research as well as improving subject matter and methods courses, in an effort to assist students in accepting innovation and improving the overall quality of teachers (10).

Westby-Gibson discusses the implications of change for in-service education. She suggests that in-service education programs should have defined objectives, focus on interested teachers, include visits to innovative centers, involve teachers in planning and evaluating the innovations and in-service programs. She recommends that if cost is a problem innovations, accompanied by appropriate preparation, should be adopted on a step by step basis (41).

Atheterton suggests that a new faculty orientation program should emphasize the history and purpose of the employing college, its faculty organization, responsibilities of teachers, and the abilities and backgrounds of its students (3).

Wise recommends reduced loads for new and relatively unexperienced teachers during their first year or term. He suggests that serior

members of the faculty be given responsibility for working with new faculty during this period (41).

Garrison reports a widespread concern of faculty for their own professional refreshment and upgrading. Faculty members cite the need for carefully led orientation and in-service education programs. They recommend that such programs utilize the resources of the college and outside consultants, and should be more than casual or perfunctory business sessions. They acknowledge that quality programs represent a substantial investment and should be budgeted as instructional costs. Faculty agree that the dean of instruction or his equivalent should be given the responsibility for the programs (16).

CHAPTER III

RATIONALE FOR ORIENTATION AND IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN INNOVATIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The rationale for faculty orientation and in-service education programs in the innovative community college is related to the belief that faculty members ought to be provided an opportunity to secure information about the college in which they have chosen to work, its students, and their roles and responsibilities as faculty members in the institution. It is legitimate to expect that faculty would wish to know the college's position on innovation, the measures the college takes to encourage and facilitate the process, conditions which may mitigate their efforts, and the opportunities and provisions for professional growth.

The concerns expressed by faculty in Garrison's study (19) are echoed by a large number of new faculty participating in a study conducted by the American Association of Junior Colleges. The major problems these faculty identified, ranked in order of their frequency, difficulty, and persistence are:

> (1) lack of time for scholarly study, (2) adopting instruction to individual differences, (3) dealing with students who require special attention to overcome deficiencies, (4) acquiring adequate secretarial help, (5) understanding college policies regarding teaching load, (6) challenging superior students, (7) obtaining needed instructional materials, (8) grading or marking students' work, and (9) understanding college policies to be followed in curriculum development and revision. (19)

Schmidt, addressing community college nursing program administrators, contends that effective orientation procedures and opportunities

for personal and professional growth contribute to retaining faculty. She states that administrators have a responsibility to devise ways and means to interest and assist faculty members in improving conditions for student learning and their own teaching (32). She continues:

> There must be a plan for this working together of the faculty, it cannot be left to change. Regularly scheduled, frequent faculty meetings to work on curriculum development are essential. Workshops for the department faculty before and at the end of the school year can be highly effective. A climate which permits faculty to introduce new ideas, try them out, admit either failure or success and proceed to revise their ideas for the next class will be rewarding and challenging to those involved. Who would want to leave this kind of situation?
>
> You are aware by now of the crucial role the nurse administrator plays in obtaining and retaining faculty in associate degree programs. You must become competent to play the roles of: facilitator, coordinator, initiator, teacher, and human relations expert. (32:16).

The concern for human relations, attention to the process of change and its effects on faculty involved are crucial to the implementation of innovative practices. Johnson notes that: "drastic and rapid change make effective human relations more essential at the same time that they become more complex and difficult" (22).

Watson regrets that efforts to introduce innovations in higher education emphasize the rational considerations and often ignore the emotional factors, dynamics of change, and human behavior involved in the process (38).

Likewise, Asher places considerable emphasis on the individual and group interactions, the problem-solving process, and communication (2).

In a previous paper, the writer raised a question regarding the nature of change and innovation which made participation so important.

"Change is often perceived by individuals as a threat to their security, status, or challenge to their competence and involving a degree of uncertainty. For these reasons, they resist change (35). These reactions can, to a degree, be overcome by making certain that change is indicated, that there is careful planning of change, that the reasons for change are communicated to those affected, and probably most important, involving those affected in the entire process (17). Faculty support for innovation comes by involving them and encouraging them to innovate rather than forcing innovation upon them (21)."

A part of that involvement and encouragement could be provided by orientation and in-service education programs.

Gardner and Sanford make statements which appear to summarize the rationale for orientation and in-service education programs in innovative community colleges.

Gardner states:

> Since we cannot really know what kinds of changes will prove useful, we must experiment. Or to put it more realistically, those of us who are tempermentally fitted for it must experiment, and the rest of us must tolerate it, even encourage it...A system that isn't innovating is a system that is dying. In the long run, the innovators are the ones who rescue all human ventures from death by decay. So value them. You don't have to be one yourself, but you should be a friend of the innovators around you. And if you don't have any around you, you had better import some. (14:49)

Sanford comments on change and experimentation.

> Developmental change can occur at any time of life. All of us, at whatever age, have potentialities that have not yet been led forth. What actually happens depends on conditions--conditions that can, to some extent at least, be controlled. Developmental change takes place when there is a challenge--of such a nature or intensity that the individual cannot manage by behaving just as he did before but must evolve new ways of responding. The challenge must not, however, be too severe--beyond the adaptive capacities of the individual--for in that case there will be a falling back upon primitive modes of adaptation. (31:52)

Perhaps orientation and in-service education programs provide those controlled challenges and conditions.

Sanford continues:

> It follows from this (the support, degree to which it influenced or was imitated by or became a model for others) that the benefits of educational experimentation may lie not so much in what can be found out from it as in the effects that it has on those who take part in it. Almost always an educational experiment interests and challenges the students who are its objects--they are touched by these signs of interest in them--and they respond by performing well and showing various signs of desirable change. And so with teachers who carry out experimental programs. Their desire to see these programs succeed leads to extra effort on their part and, most important, to a fresh interest in students; this makes them better teachers, and the students respond by behaving as the designers of the experiment predicted. Thus it is that processes which make scientific work in this field extraordinarily difficult are the very ones that lead to immediate educational gains. (31:63)

CHAPTER IV

THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF ORIENTATION AND IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN INNOVATIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Interviews with Faculty, Administrators, and Supporting Staff in Selected Community Colleges

It was believed to be beneficial to talk with individuals at a limited number of community colleges which could be characterized as innovative or striving to be innovative in their approaches to curriculum and instruction. Arrangements for the visits were made through the deans of instruction in two colleges and the coordinator of instructional services in the third. The request was made to talk with the administrator, who identified faculty members and other individuals involved in innovative practices. Busy schedules of college personnel precluded a larger number of longer interviews. Interviews were conducted with the following:

Dean of Instruction	2
Coordinator of Instructional Services	1
Dean of Technical-Vocational Education	1
Division Chairman	1
Faculty	2
Tutor	1
Audio-Visual Technicians	3

Questions were asked pertaining to orientation programs and innovative practices. The interviews are summarized as follows.

Dean of Instruction

Our faculty were hired on the basis that they would innovate. Their orientation actually began when they were hired. They were given the responsibility to select texts, order equipment, supplies, and other materials. Our orientation program is brief and much of the actual orientation is left to the division chairman. Faculty members are not given any release time to work on innovations, but if they come up with good ideas we try to get money to support them.

Dean of Instruction

The orientation of faculty actually begins with the first interview. I talk with them about such things as their interest in innovation, the thrust of our institution, the opportunities here, Mager, behavioral objectives, and faculty evaluation. There is a three-day orientation for faculty. In the half day allotted to me, I involved faculty who had participated in a summer project related to the development of innovative materials. As a result, I had more volunteers than I could finance. Beginning this fall (1969) I am adding an associate dean of instruction for educational development, whose primary responsibility is to facilitate innovation and in-service training--and this will help. I try to make stars of faculty members who innovate by giving them praise, additional financial support and other services. It's important not to try to move too fast for faculty. Build innovations in increments and provide enough supportive staff. If release time is granted to faculty, the results of their work belong to the college.

Dean of Technical-Vocational Education

We don't have a planned orientation program, but recently we did have a one-day retreat for all faculty. The emphasis was on problem areas and we approached it through group interaction. The results were a questioning of our past efforts, a feeling that the student pleas for relevant education were valid, that student demands for participation were valid, and that we ought to look at what people in other areas were doing to improve instruction.

Coordinator of Instructional Services

I am in a staff position so am not in a position to formally orient faculty or insist that faculty use audio-visual materials. I do

try, though, to get faculty to identify the teaching problem, and to develop behavioral objectives before they begin to use any hardware. I also work with faculty to sequence instructional events and identify the best medium for presenting each stimulus. I guess my major role is to encourage and provide assistance.

Division Chairman

I have the main responsibility for faculty orientation. I'd like my faculty to innovate, but there's not enough time. Even writing behavioral objectives takes time.

Faculty

I was hired on the basis that I would innovate. I came with the understanding that it was my responsibility to attempt to develop new approaches and if I didn't want to do this, I shouldn't work at this college. I didn't receive any formal orientation, but as soon as I was hired I was given the responsibility of selecting texts, materials, supplies, and equipment. I don't receive any release time; what I do is strictly on my own.

* * * * * * *

I didn't receive a formal orientation. Since I bought the college's approach, have a background in my subject, and in the approach to instruction, I didn't feel I needed a formal orientation. I do have to make my own tapes and single concept films, and this takes time.

Tutor

I received a one-day orientation. It wasn't much, but since I set up the lab, answer questions, and sometimes help with quizzes, but don't develop any materials, I guess it was enough.

Audio-Visual Technician

I am not involved in faculty orientation, but I do try to work with faculty to help them see new ways to teach. I suggest ways to change if what they are doing isn't effective. Of course I also am responsible for taking care of technical aspects involved in a presentation or preparation of materials.

Two Technicians (same institution)

We try to support the faculty in every way we can. We explain what is available, how to use equipment and prepare materials.

Faculty Orientation at Oakland Community College

The orientation program for faculty at Oakland Community College is worthy of note, since it represented an effort by a college administration to prepare a faculty for developing and implementing a college-wide systems approach to education.

On July 1, 1965, approximately seventy faculty members were assembled for two months of intensive instruction in the systems approach and in the preparation of instructional materials. Staff of the Instructional Materials Division of Litton Industries were hired as consultants to assist the faculty in the planning, design, and beginning implementation of the OCC instructional systems.

During the eight-week period from July 1 through August 31, the faculty members literally were students and given performance objectives to achieve. We attended group assembly sessions, read materials, and listened on such topics as instructional systems, task analysis, student characteristics, tests, measurements and criterion questions, and media selection. We saw films, demonstrations of media, talked with consultants and specialists in the various aspects of instructional systems, media, audiotutorial instruction, programmed instruction. Simultaneously, using the knowledge we were acquiring, we prepared materials for the fall course offerings.

Mager's book was referred to as our "Bible" (25). Many materials and texts were distributed or made easily accessible to the faculty. Bloom, Carpenter, Corrigan, Postlethwait, and Smith were amont the many names which became familiar to us (6, 8, 12, 30, 33).

We studied and talked about task analysis, student characteristics, tests, measurements, criterion questions, selecting media and performance objectives. A specific topic was covered each day and we worked on assignments which corresponded to the topics.

Consultants from Litton Industries and Howard and Smith made most of the daily presentations and were available for consultation with faculty members. Experts such as Dr. Samuel Postlethwait, Colonel Gabriel Ofiesh, and Dr. B. Lamar Johnson provided us with consultation assistance and inspirational leadership.

In a college which based its total instructional program on a systems approach, and where faculty members and administrative staff were inexperienced in the approach, a formal rigorous orientation program was vital to the implementation of the system. The highly structured orientation program and consultants provided faculty with the "know-how" to prepare the instructional materials.

We as faculty members did not readily accept the totally new approach. We were being asked to change. Previously-held notions regarding education and our expertise were challenged. Many of us displayed the reactions commonly associated with change. We perceived threats to our security, status, competence and responded with hostility, defensiveness and resistance. The consultants, possessing skills of psychology, were expert in helping us work through our feelings as well as providing the technical expertise required by the introduction of the systems approach.

Limitations of time and space do not permit further reflections on the Oakland Community College story. Suffice it to say the pressures

experienced by many others in new community colleges were shared at Oakland Community College. Orientation and in-service education were not given all the attention and emphasis they required. This manifested itself, I believe, in the difficulties faculty experienced in understanding and implementing the systems approach, in their morale, and effectiveness in causing learning. The concern was felt by all and renewed efforts are being made to improve and strengthen the orientation and in-service education programs.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDED GUIDELINES FOR ORIENTATION AND IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN INNOVATIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

OR

HOW TO DO IT

In the introduction to this study the deficiencies in orientation and in-service education programs in community colleges were noted. It was indicated that the problem was one of greater magnitude in colleges which sought to encourage, introduce, and implement innovative practices. Since colleges vary in the degree and extent to which they innovate, recommendations for specific programs will not be made, but guidelines which could be implemented singly or collectively by a college will be recommended. Since orientation and in-service education are, for all intents and purposes, cut out of the same cloth, guidelines which may be applied to both and, to a great extent, to the colleges' total efforts to encourage and effect change and innovation will be suggested.

Tye, in a monograph of value to those concerned with change, states: "Education can be improved. The first step in such improvement is to understand the change process. A second step is to establish goals. Beyond that, one needs a will and a way or working" (42:15).

It is the intent that these guidelines will contribute suggestions to develop the will and the way of working.

1. Determine the college's posture toward in-service education and innovation.
2. Determine the background, experience and needs of present and

newly-hired faculty. Enlist the assistance of the personnel department in preparing this information. Obtain it in time to use in planning orientation and in-service education programs.

3. Establish and keep the channels of communication open.
4. Include an item in the budget to allow for orientation and in-service education and innovation.
5. Have administrative officers responsible for instruction and students formulate plans for a college committee for innovation. Select instructional faculty, counseling faculty, learning resources staff and students to be on committee. Include individuals, if possible, with a background in learning, media and research on the committee. If the college is new, select the committee members during the hiring period and the initial counseling period for students.
6. Develop goals and objectives for orientation and in-service education programs.
7. Make plans to evaluate your programs. Use pre and post tests or other methods of assessment. Design tools to gather data. Put the R and D staff to work.
8. Devote attention to the process of change in committee and faculty sessions.
9. Make plans for orientation sessions well in advance of the start of the fall term. Make it possible for all faculty to attend.

10. Make orientation and in-service education programs more than housekeeping sessions. Suggestions for content include the community college, students, instructional approaches, the process of change, evaluation. Certainly one should not overlook the college philosophy, personnel policies, and operational details, but they should not comprise the entire session. Investigate the possibilities of preparing the latter for independent faculty study.
11. Make plans for in-service education programs well in advance of the start of the school year so that they may be put into effect when the classes begin. Establish a regular meeting time and make it worth the while of the faculty to attend.
12. Utilize new media in programs. This is a good opportunity to demonstrate it to faculty. Then have it available for faculty to investigate. This applies to both hardware and soft-ware.
13. Provide reference materials for faculty use. Make them readily available, and where possible, give each member his own copy.
14. Make time in schedules whether the opening orientation sessions or faculty workshops, for "happy hours". These breaks provide an opportunity for faculty and administrators to exchange ideas on a more informal basis.
15. Provide opportunities in orientation and in-service education programs for individual, small group, and large group sessions.
15. Spread the "gospel" of change and innovation to all faculty members, and if in a voluntary system, concentrate your efforts on the innovators.

17. Upon occasion and if finances permit, bring outstanding authorities in the field to the college to talk and consult with faculty. They may provide a needed "shot in the arm" to innovators and arouse the curiosity of the non-innovators.
18. Explore the possibility of instituting sensitivity training sessions for faculty on a voluntary basis.
19. Provide "sounding boards" or opportunities for faculty to "let off steam" or ventilate when they are involved in intensive orientation or in-service sessions.
20. Begin your campaign to secure innovators toward the end of the school year and when hiring new faculty members. Try to provide some time to bring them together to work during the summer.
21. Provide incentives for those who innovate. It may be released time, although I consider this almost a must, or opportunities to attend professional meetings. Don't overlook the value of praise.
22. Back your innovators with the technical expertise and clerical and research assistance they need to do an effective job. Remember that the innovators are often your best teachers and should have opportunities to work with students. They are usually good at selling innovation, too.
23. Get a commitment from the innovators and make a commitment to them. The guidelines suggest a number of aspects vital to commitments.

The former president of Oakland Community College made a statement in his message in the 1967 college bulletin. I believe that it could be another guideline for orientation and in-service education programs in innovative colleges.

"The dispensing of information need not be devious, nor the acquisition of that knowledge painful. There is nothing immoral about enjoying learning."

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Faculty members are concerned about the orientation and in-service education they receive. They want to know more about a college than how supplies are ordered and average age of the student body. They want to do a better job of teaching and to play a part in determining what goes on in the college. Many want to learn more about behavioral objectives and newer media but are, at the time, fearful of what change will mean to them. In many instances, the colleges in which they work provide little in the way of orientation and in-service education programs. Faculty are not well prepared to be innovators.

Administrators have little to guide them in preparing faculty to be innovators. Administrators who "come up from the ranks" may have little background in what to include in the content of orientation and in-service education programs since they experienced so little themselves. Administrators may find it difficult to be agents of change or to work with faculty and students to effect change and innovation in curriculum and instruction.

Interviews revealed that introduction to innovation was made during the initial interviews with faculty, and then, to a great extent, was left up to faculty initiative to pursue. Providing release time was not a usual practice, but limited numbers of faculty were being involved in summer workshops. The colleges visited did not have formal faculty orientation programs. Those interviewed seemed to believe that their present approach was the best that could be done at the present time and

under existing conditions. They expressed concern for lack of time and financial resources. These concerns did not over-shadow their enthusiasm about, and commitment to, the work in which they were involved.

Guidelines for orientation and in-service education programs in innovative community colleges were recommended. They focused on (1) suggestions for content, (2) suggestions for the planning of the sessions, (3) evaluation, (4) communication, (5) human relations, (6) preparation for change, (7) wide participation and involvement, (8) incentives, and (9) administrative concerns.

It was suggested that these guidelines might well provide the will and way of working in our efforts to improve education. Made operational, they might also lessen the reason for an instructor to remark:

> I really flapped around here my first semester.... it took me about a semester to get my bearings and to have some kind of realistic notion about what this college is trying to do, and my part in it. (16:47-48)

When do we begin?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adelson, Marvin, "Educational Ends and Innovational Means." Inventing Education for the Future. Edited by Werner Hirsch. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co, 1967.

2. Asher, James J. "Inservice Education-Psychological Perspectives." Berkeley, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1967.

3. Atheterton, John W. "Expectations and Responsibilities of the Employing Colleges," in Improving College Teaching, edited by Calvin B.T. Lee, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

4. Baskin, Samuel, editor, Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1965.

5. Brawer, Florence B. Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

6. Bloom, Benjamin, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain, New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

7. Brickell, Henry M. Organizing New York State for Educational Change, Albany: State Education Department, 1961.

8. Carpenter, C.R. Strategies of Learning and Learning Resources, paper presented at a National Conference on Implications of New Media for the Teaching of Library Sciences, May 27-29, Chicago.

9. Carpenter and Greenhill, "The New Media" in Higher Education, Some Newer Developments, Samuel Baskin Editor: New York, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1965.

10. Cogen, Charles, "The Teacher and Educational Change," in Inventing Education for the Future, edited by Werner Hersch, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1967.

11. Cooper, Russell M. "Faculty Development Programs", In Search of Leaders. Edited by G.K. Smith, T. Erhard, C. Macquineas. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, National Education Association of the United States, 1967.

12. Corrigan, Robert E. and Kaufman, Roger A. Why the Instructional Systems Approach? Anaheim, California: Litton Instructional Materials, Inc. 1965.

13. Dale, Edgar. "The Innovator and the Establishment," In Search of Leaders. Edited by G.K. Smith, T. Erhard, C. MacGuineas. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, National Education Association of the United States, 1967.

14. Gardner, John W. No Easy Victories. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

15. Gardner, John W. Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

16. Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

17. Ginsburg, E. and Reilly, "The Process of Change", Readings in Managerial Psychology. Edited by H.J. Leavitt. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

18. Gusfield, Joseph, "The Faculty and Institutional Climate", paper presented at Workshop Conference to Foster Innovation in Higher Education, Union for Research and Experimentation in Higher Education, April 25-29, 1967.

19. Heleford, Karl T. Jamrich, and Siehr, Hugeo E. Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges, Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1963.

20. Hoffer, Eric. The Ordeal of Change, New York, Harper and Row, 1964.

21. Jensen, Mary E. "The Role of the Administrator in Facilitating Innovation in Community Colleges", unpublished seminar paper, Los Angeles, University of California at Los Angeles, 1968.

22. Johnson, B. Lamar. Islands of Innovation Expanding. Galley Proof, 1968.

23. Kuescher, Robert E. "An Appraisal of Some Dimensions of Systems Theory as Indicators of the Tendency to Innovate in Selected Public Junior Colleges," Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Los Angeles, University of California at Los Angeles, 1968.

24. Lindman, Erick L. "The School Administrator and Educational Innovation." in Inventing Eeucation for the Future. Edited by Werner Hirsch. San Francisco: Changler Publishing Co. 1967.

25. Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives, Palo Alto, Fearon Publishers, 1962.

26. Michael, Donald N. "Inhibitors and Facilitors to the Acceptance of Educational Innovations." in Inventing Education for the Future. edited by Werner Hirsch. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co. 1967.

27. Miles, Matthew B. editor, Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

28. Nasatir, David, "Resistance to Innovation in American Education" in Inventing Education for the Future. Editor, Werner Hirsch, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co. 1967.

29. Novotony, Jerrold, M. "Staff Involvement" in The Principal and the Challenge of Change, Bentzen, Goodlad, et al. Los Angeles: Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc. 1968.

30. Postlethwait, Samuel N. An Integrated Experience Approach to Learning. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co. 1964.

31. Sanford. Nevitt, "Implications for Education and for Adjustment of Curricula to Individual Students", in Universal Higher Education, edited by Earl J. McGrath, New York, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1966.

32. Schmidt, Mildred. Obtaining and Keeping Faculty in an Associate Degree Nursing Program, a paper presented at the fifth meeting of the Southern Regional Education Education Board Council on Collegiate Education for Nursing, October 21, 1965, Atlanta, Georgia.

33. Smith, Robert G. The Development of Training Objectives. A paper prepared for the faculty orientation program, Oakland Community College. Instructional Materials Division, Litton Industries, 1965.

34. Swansburg, Russell, C. Inservice Education, New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.

35. Tannenbaum, Robert and others. Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

36. Tye, Kenneth A. "Creating Disequilibrium", in The Principal and the Challenge of Change, Bentzen, Goodlad et al. Los Angeles: Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc. 1968.

37. Upton, Miller. "Acceptance of Major Curricular Changes", In Search of Leaders. Edited by G.K. Smith, T. Erhard, C. MacGuineas. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, National Education Association of the United States, 1967.

38. Watson, Goodwin, "Innovation: Processes, Practices and Research" in Innovations in Higher Education: Developments, Research and Priorities, edited by Samuel Baskin, New Dimensions in Higher Education monograph 19, -- Durham, N.C., Duke University and U.S. Office of Education, 1967.

39. Wessell, Nils, "The Process of Innovation." in Improving College Teaching, edited by Calvin B.T. Lee, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

40. Westby-Gibson, Dorothy, "Inservice Education--Perspectives for Education", Berkeley, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Review, 1967.

41. Wise, W. Max. "Who Teaches the Teachers" in Improving College Teaching, edited by Calvin B.T. Lee, Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1968.